


Contestability Working Group - Conf Call		 UTILITY REGULATOR ELECTRICITY GAS WATER	
Subject: Contestability Working Group – meeting with Lloyd’s Register		Date: 30/11/2020	Time: 10:30am
Attendees:	Title	Representing	
Aidan Gunning	AG	EW	
Owen McGuckin	OM	EW	
Chris Kingston	CK	EW	
Kenny McPartland	KMP	UR	
Jody O’Boyle	JOB	UR	
Sinead Ferris	SF	NIEN	
Nigel Crawford	NC	NIEN	
Carl Hashim	CH	NIEN	
Sarah Friedel	SF	SONI	
Kevin O’Neil	KON	SONI	
Les Thomas	LT	Lloyd’s Register	
Bernie Woods	BW	Lloyd’s Register	
Carl Miller	CM	Lloyd’s Register	
Apologies:			
Circulation: External			

Item	Main discussion points
1	<p>Agenda</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introductions • Overview of contestability history in NI • Opportunity for attendees from Lloyd’s to give an overview of contestability in GB and allow for other members of the CWG to ask questions. <p>-----</p> <p>JOB thanked and welcomed the attendees to the meeting. JOB opened the floor for introductions and then provided an overview of contestability history in Northern Ireland for the benefit of the attendees from Lloyd’s Register. JOB explained;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Energy is devolved in NI • There is one TSO and DSO (different to GB) • Before contestability was introduced NIEN had a monopoly on connections in NI • Contestability call for evidence was kicked off in 2014, followed by a consultation for introducing contestability in NI. A working group was established to progress contestability • 2015 next steps paper and final decision paper was issued

Item	Main discussion points
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2016 NIEN and SONI established guidelines for contestability in NI, NIEN developed an ICP portal. • The market opened in 2 phases, the first phase of contestability was only open to load and generation connections 5MW and greater. The second phase was done for all new connections. • Currently reviewing the contestability/non contestability works, we are keen to develop competition for ICPs and connection progress in NI, thus have re-established the working group. • We are keen to understand what has occurred in GB in contestability and learn from these experiences <p>SF – NIEN’s perspective is that the current framework is clear in terms of where ICPs carryout greenfield work and NIEN are doing final connections. Important as part of due diligence is to learn and be educated as to how final connections become contestable in GB and any risks that came with that and to understand the processes were put in place and want we need to consider in NI;</p> <p>LT asks about the rules currently in place for connections in NI.</p> <p>NC highlights that NIEN have their own safety rules in place that have to be adhered to, to be able to adopt the assets.</p> <p>-SF asks BW about when final connections were made in GB and if he could explain his experience from that time.</p> <p>BW worked for an ICP around this time final connections were made contestable. There wasn’t a great deal of issues or problems when LV jointing became contestable. It was done in a phased approach which worked very well.</p> <p>At the beginning ICP’s (who held accreditation for live jointing) were involved in pilots to make network connections, they had to agree with the DNO that they had the correct procedures in place and the right staff with the capabilities and experiences to carry out this work. Only ICP’s with live jointing accreditation could go on the pilot.</p> <p>DNO’s ensured all paperwork, agreements and competencies were in place with ICPS, they then had to witness the early connections work carried out by ICPs onto the DNO system.</p> <p>Once the pilot phase was complete things continued to progress in GB including work around switching and work up to 11kV in GB. BW acknowledges differences in NI as there is only 1 DNO who controls the network and this could be an advantage to NIEN as we could move forward at a faster pace than GB which has a much bigger and more complex operation.</p> <p>-SF asks if ICPs were operating under DNO safety rules.</p>

Item	Main discussion points
	<p>BW highlights that ICPs have their own safety rules but also must adhere to Energy Network Association (ENA) safety rules also. Once ICP's were given control of the network their safety rules applied from that point moving forward. BW states that a lot of the jointers already hold DNO safety rules because they work across boundaries, BW acknowledges this is similar with NI jointers but limited to point of work and under instruction from NIE N authorised staff, this would not be the case when competition progresses.</p> <p>-SF asks if this was introduced that ICPs would be responsible if they are operating under their own safety rules.</p> <p>BW - yes, the DNO did not want responsibility for what the ICP was doing, therefore they had to work under their own safety rules.</p> <p>-SF asks about the live jointing accreditation process and how this works (particular to NI)</p> <p>BW- You would need to look at the experience of the jointer. Systems can be complex and it is the ICP's responsibility to have competent, experienced staff who can carry out the connections work. BW states they would look at jointer CVs and if they hold the safety rules for the DNO. ICPs should have a robust framework in place for carrying out connections and they people designing these frameworks are competent.</p> <p>SF asks about communication between ICPs and DNOs in GB. SF highlights this is a key area to get right for NI.</p> <p>BW states that NI doesn't have live jointing currently, but various elements of the connections work will need to be communicated effectively;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - scheduling of the work - when connection will be made - If in the early days NIEN may want to witness the work, this will need to be arranged - ICPs need to get the records back to NIEN ASAP as live equipment will be on the system <p>BW states that communications should already be occurring between NIEN and ICPs for current connection work, this will be an extension of that work and enhancing the documents, paper work, document transmittal systems etc.</p> <p>SF asks Electricity Works about cable identification process and if they envisaged doing this in Urban Networks or more radial service side networks.</p> <p>AG states it would be more radial to begin with and then moving to urban areas.</p>

Item	Main discussion points
	<p>BW would expect the organisations have procedures in place to identify cables, including processes in place if a cable can't be identified.</p> <p>JOB asks how long the pilots ask for in GB.</p> <p>BW is unsure of this, but would find out.</p> <p>SF asks about liability/responsibility in the connections work</p> <p>LT highlights that one of the requirements that needs to be in place is where the correct levels of responsibility are, where liability starts and ends as well as warranty periods.</p> <p>SF agrees and highlights these are all processes we need to finalise before we get up and running.</p> <p>SF asks Electricity works if they had a view on the control of the networks when it came to carrying out connections.</p> <p>AG suggest that NIEN would remain in control of the network with the ICP doing the final connection.</p> <p>BW states he will find out what was involved in the first phase of the pilot in GB for connections contestability in GB and what the ICP was allowed to do.</p> <p>SF highlights that the phased approach is the best method to the connections, currently looking at final connections at LV, once complete we can look at other elements of contestability.</p> <p>AG agrees that the phased approach is important but we should keep moving forward towards the first pilot.</p> <p>JOB also agrees that the staged approach is the best way forward. JOB states we should look to learn from GB's experiences.</p> <p>NC asks if it is a similar role for all ICP's in that they all have to follow the same guidelines.</p> <p>BW states all ICPs will follow the same safety guidelines.</p> <p>NC states that NIEN safety rules will need to be amended to accommodate any changes to allow ICPs can make the necessary connections.</p> <p>BW reinforces that there were no major issues that occurred in GB when this was introduced in GB, all parties wanted to get it right.</p>

Item	Main discussion points
	<p>CM echoes this point. He states that when competition was introduced in GB there was a natural fear from asset owners in relation to processes, procedures and who would be involved with the assets and connection. With time this fear was not warranted. The scheme has been very successful in GB and well managed by all involved and everyone involved is aware of potential risks and how to ensure these don't arise.</p> <p>SF agrees with this and states that they are happy to learn about phase 1 in GB and this collaboration and shared learning is very important.</p> <p>BW and LT highlight that this is the right approach and to ensure communications continues.</p> <p>BW highlights that there have been forums set up in GB (NERS (National Electricity Registration Scheme) Provider and Advisory Panel and NERSAP), these have been useful in promoting collaboration amongst DNOs and ICPs and to talk about any ongoing issues and allow knowledge sharing of connections. These regular meetings (such as CWG) are important to keep high levels of communication and transparency. There is the option for connections stakeholders in NI to attend the 2 mentioned forums in GB.</p> <p><u>Next Steps</u> Learn from phase one of connections contestability in GB (to be provided by Lloyds) with a view to the UR preparing a call for evidence to be issued as soon as possible. CFE will highlight; -Elements of connections process that are contestable and non-contestable -What has occurred in GB -What we are planning to do in NI (phased approach) and request participants to give their opinion on this -Highlight the CWG continuation (further develop it) the and potential to join other forums in GB</p>
2	<p>Actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lloyds to provide information on phase 1 of the pilot in GB in relation to contestability - Once information on phase 1 is provided the UR to draft up a call for evidence and keep in contact with NIEN/ SONI and Electricity Works in relation to the timings and contents of CFE.